THE ECONOMIC THEOLOGY OF QUAKERISM

Martin Brigham and Donncha Kavanagh

Introducing Quakerism[1]

Quakerism was one outgrowth of the Protestant Reformation's long wave begun by Martin Luther in 1517. Founded by George Fox (1624–1691), the Society of Friends as Quakers call themselves, emerged as a non-conformist and dissenting religious movement in mid-seventeenth century England, during a period of intense political unrest, religious turmoil and civil upheaval—termed the "Century of Revolution" by historians. At the heart of Quaker thought and practice is the idea that their faith is based on a direct relationship with, and experience of, God or the Divine, unmediated by creeds, rituals or a religious hierarchy. Quakers have always emphasised the integration of inward reflection and outward action, and have ceased to wait "upon a miraculous event and turned to the present miracle that Christ was waiting to perform daily in their hearts" (Castle 1941: 34).

While Quakerism is rooted in seventeenth-century Christian thought, it also rejects the idea of following a creed, which means that many Quakers today, particularly "un-programmed Friends" in the UK and US, no longer see themselves as Christians or waiting to be saved by the resurrection of Christ. Consequently, there is now a diversity of non-theist, ecumenical and inter- and multi-faith Quakers. And while there are now different branches of Quakerism—Conservative, Liberal, Pastoral, and Evangelical—all Quakers share beliefs that go back to the foundation of the movement in the 1650s, particularly the importance of connecting beliefs and everyday worldly actions.

---

[1] This chapter is based on Kavanagh and Brigham's (2018, 2019) analysis of Quaker business.

Quakers have always been small in number and outside of "mainstream" society: in 1680, when their strength was probably at its height, there were approximately 60,000 in England and Wales (1.15% per of the population) (Wrigley and Schofield 1989: 92–5). In 2012, the number of Quakers in England and Wales was 13,906 which is almost identical to the number in 1860, though it only constitutes 0.02% of the population. Currently there are 1,500 Quakers in Ireland (also 0.02% of the population), while Quakers worldwide today number about 360,000.

This chapter focuses on the practices of the Liberal branch of Quakerism in England, Wales and Ireland from around 1650 to around 1930 (Navias 2012:4-11). We aim to understand both the connections and disconnections between theological values, business practice and economic thinking that created the possibilities and growth for Quaker business people and which led to the eventual decline of what might be called the "Holy Experiment" of Quaker business ("Holy Experiment" is the term associated with William Penn's attempt in the 1670s to create a new community for Quakers and other minorities in what would become the American state of Pennsylvania).

Undivided belief and actions in life and business

Quakers' success in business has to be understood in relation to the beliefs and practices that have been persistently reproduced since the Quakers emerged in the mid-seventeenth century. The most important is "that of God in everyone," often referred to as the "Inner Light". Believing that there is God in everyone means that each person is of particular and equal interest and value, and that this can be fostered in people and in social relations. This way of knowing the Light is also a way of discovering truth; in many ways it is a scientific method applied to religious experience – to catch sight of the Light and to make more of it through a discipline of discovery. According to Castle (1941: 35), it is "not a capacity to believe in the

improbable or an acceptance of beliefs others say are true, but a means of discovering truth … We shall gain assurance, one way of another, by intermittent but accumulating glimpses of truth which will appear in proportion as we have acted faithfully on the assumption that they were true".

The contention "that of God in everyone" meant that the first Quakers believed that everyone is equal before God. From this distinct belief, traditional distinctions (in language, conduct, dress, for example) were irrelevant, as was hierarchy, formal or paid leadership or ministers, which is why they saw, unlike other Protestants with whom they diverged, no need for an educated clergy to lead and interpret "holy" books. This egalitarian philosophy also meant that Quakers were hostile to established authority, and so they would not pay tithes to the church, nor remove their hats to acknowledge superiors, nor swear oaths. For such actions they were persecuted violently from the earliest years: by 1660 more than 4,000 Quaker men were incarcerated.

Quakers had no place for creedal formulas, set rituals, biblical stories about the past, or narratives about salvation in the future. Instead they focused on their inner spirit, especially through a distinctive practice of silent waiting and listening. The early Quakers formalised this practice as an organizational structure of local worshiping communities and monthly, regional/quarterly and yearly meetings, which continues to this day. From the earliest days, the term "Meeting" has been at the centre of Quaker practice. The most important is the meeting for worship which is the central shared experience of Quakers. It is akin to what other denominations might call a church service, though there is no role for a priest or minister and meetings are pervaded by silent worship. Typically held for an hour on Sunday mornings, a meeting for worship is a gathering of a group of individuals waiting, mostly in silence, for the enlightening and empowering presence of the Divine. If moved to do so, anyone attending the meeting can speak—give vocal ministry—on any subject.

Corporate decision making occurs through monthly "meetings for worship for business" which take place after the meeting for worship (for a discussion of the contemporary relevance of the Quaker business method, see Burton 2017). *Contra* conventional understanding, in which we are responsible for what we say, Quakers view decision-making as a process premised upon communal, attentive and listening silence. They distinguish between "the sense of a meeting" and consensus. Consensus forms of decision-making often involve the integration of differing positions within a group and a majority will—as in a democracy. In contrast, Quakers do not vote at meetings, but rather discern the sense of the meeting: agreement is "sensed" and not voted on (Sheeran 1983). For Morley (1993: 5), "Sense of the meeting works because we turn our decision making over to a higher power". This experiential approach, which dispenses with prepared statements, echoes psychoanalytic approaches to group dynamics and some Eastern religions.

Quaker philosophy is liberal and individualistic, though it is not centred on rational self-interest or egotism. Rather, they believe that if the goodness of each individual is given adequate expression, then the "inner Light" of each will unite the community in brotherhood and peace. The other person is not a competitor in a Darwinian struggle for survival, but rather another servant of the community, which they see as fundamental: "Mutual service should be the principle upon which life is organised. Service, not private gain, should be the motive of all work" (Society of Friends 1918, quoted in Child 1964: 295). Hence, the function of industry is to serve the community as a whole rather than to accumulate personal wealth, which they saw as almost an accidental by-product of their commitment to a puritan way of life that extolled the merits of hard work, careful husbandry of talents and stewardship of resources, and personal renunciation, all for the service of others (see Hopper and Hopper 2010 for an extended discussion of Puritans and management culture in the US). While the Quakers were at odds with the Puritans over matters theological, they shared important

features of the Protestant ethic as Weber (2002/1905) had discerned – a commitment to hard work and dislike of waste, which aligned them quite well with employers" concerns for efficiency and worker effort. Philanthropy was also in accord with the Quaker belief in the morality of simplicity and plainness, and the notion that one should not flaunt one's prosperity.

Quakers' undivided worldview – a commitment to egalitarianism, individualism and a view of people as ends in themselves rather than means to others' purposes – created tensions for Quaker business people as they were against the exploitation and profit of one individual at the expense of another, which has traditionally made them uneasy with the morality of business profit. However, this uneasiness did not stop them from engaging in business, even if one Quaker businessman asserted that "the title of Quaker employer…[is] a flat contradiction in terms" (Society of Friends 1938: 23). Instead, it merely spurred those Quakers who went into business to devise and implement a range of democratic structures and progressive processes in the workplace, which have been a feature of Quaker businesses since the seventeenth century (Raistrick 1950/1968). These structures went as far as recognizing the principle of joint control, with workers taking part in the commercial and financial administration of the business. For example in 1916, Joseph Rowntree (1836–1925)—whose family owned the chocolate manufacturer Rowntree's that at the time had over 5,000 employees—urged workers to claim a share in industrial decision-making as a "matter of right" (Child 1964: 301).

Quaker businesses were also characterized by benevolent paternalistic control, coupled with an acute sense of the employer's moral duty to employees which they instantiated in innovative and extensive welfare benefits. For instance, Joseph Rowntree and his son Seebohm—described by Urwick (1962) as "the father of British management"—introduced a wide range of employee benefits including a suggestion scheme (1902), a pension scheme

(1906), widows' pension (1916), annual holidays with full pay (1918), central works council (1919) and profit sharing (1923) (Vernon and Rowntree 1958; Barclay 1995). The bigger Quaker companies also built model factories, with adjoining model villages, and provided medical services, schools, libraries and gymnasia for their workers, long before the "Human Relations" movement developed in the 1930s. While their practices might suggest otherwise, Quakers did not endorse socialism because of that tradition's focus on power, collective action, conflict and social class.

From the earliest days, Quakers were deeply concerned with social, political and ethical issues and took prominent roles in various campaigns, such as the fight against slavery with Quaker colonists denouncing slavery in Barbados from 1688, advocating penal reform, initiating new models of industrial welfare, promoting universal education, and caring for the poor. They were also noted for their pacifism and their abhorrence of all outward wars, which can be traced back to their own original experiences of persecution.

Quaker impact on business and management

Though small in number, the Quakers' relative invisibility belies their historical and contemporary impact, as they have produced a remarkable and disproportionate number of businesspeople, scientists, engaged thinkers, and campaigners for justice, peace and human rights (Furtado 2013). The British industrial system was based on family owned businesses, an extraordinary number of which were Quaker-owned including many of the largest and most technologically advanced. Table 1 lists some of the more important Quaker companies, most of which were formed in England and Wales. Many of these have now been merged into or acquired by other companies. While other enterprises might not be described as Quaker, members of the Society of Friends played central roles in the formation of major

companies like IBM (Belden and Belden 1962), Sony, Price Waterhouse, and J. Walter Thompson (Windsor 1980).

Quakers have traditionally campaigned for human rights and actively engaged in conflict resolution. For example, Quakers founded Oxfam in 1942, they were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1947, and, from 2001, Elizabeth Fry, the nineteenth-century Quaker campaigner for the humane treatment of prisoners, was depicted on the Bank of England £5 note.

Table 1. Examples of Quaker companies, with date of establishment	
	Company/Family
Accounting	Price Waterhouse (1865)
Banking	Barclays (1690), Lloyds (1765), Guerney (1775)
Biscuits	Huntley & Palmer (1822), Carr (1831), Jacobs (1851)
Brewing	Truman & Hanbury (1781), Young & Co. (1831), Burton (1842)
Chemicals	Allen & Hanbury (1715), Crosfields (1814), Reckitt (1840), Albright & Wilson (1856)
Chocolate	Fry's (1761), Huntley & Palmers (1822) , Cadbury (1824), Rowntree (1862)
Clockmaking	Tompion (1670), Quare (1671), Graham (1738), Huntsman (1740)
Glass	Waterford Crystal (1783)

Engineering	Ransomes (1789), Baker Perkins (1878)
Life Insurance	Friends Provident (1832)
Match manufacturing	Bryant & May (1843)
Metals	Bristol Brass Company (1702), London Lead Mining (1705), Rawlinson (1720), Huntsman (1740), Ransome (1789)
Newspapers	News Chronicle (1855)
Paper & Packaging	John Dickinson Stationary (1804), E.S. & A. Robinson (1844)
Pottery & China	Cookworthy (1730), Champion (1773),
Retailing	Laws Stores (1885)
Shoemakers	C & J Clark (1825)
Shipbuilding	Swan Hunter (1880)
Steelmaking	Consett Iron Company (1864), Stewarts & Lloyds (1859)
Textiles	Gurney (1683), Were (1686), Barclays (1690), English Sewing Cotton (1897)
Note: Because of mergers, acquisitions and name changes, the dates indicated might be contested.	

In the sphere of management, Frederick Taylor was the son of a notable Quaker family in Philadelphia, while Mary Parker Follett (often called "the mother of management") and Wroe

Alderson (similarly, called "the father of marketing") were from Quaker backgrounds. It was also in this New World milieu that another Quaker, Joseph Wharton, founded America's first business school, the Wharton School in 1881 (Baltzell 1996). Wharton also co-founded and was the major shareholder in Bethlehem Steel Corporation, and employed Frederick Taylor in 1898 with the express purpose of applying more scientific approaches to managing the factory (Copley 1923).

The Quaker association with business was partly because they were relative outsiders to society – for example, they were only admitted to English universities after the 1870s – and were precluded from most professions and guilds. This meant that Quakers typically did not get involved in traditional businesses but were instead to be found in new, innovative sectors. Their scepticism towards authority and received wisdoms—some see Quakerism as a "religion of uncertainty" (Pym 1999:137)—also made them ready and willing to formulate and associate themselves with new explanations for the social and natural world, an attribute that aligned them well with the emerging scientific ethos of their time. Hence it is perhaps no surprise that their influence was most important during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when many Quakers played a key role in the industrial revolution that led to Britain dominating world trade and commerce. Quakers were also innovative with respect to the managerial and social aspects of their businesses, and were the first—or among the first—to adopt a wide range of business initiatives, as catalogued in Table 2 (drawn from Windsor's (1980) study of Quakers in business).

Table 2. Business innovations pioneered by Quakers	
Marketing	Fixed prices; press advertising
Operations	Vertical integration of extraction, production and

	distribution
Finance	Commercial paper (unsecured, short-term debt instrument issued by a corporation)
Employee relations	Adult education on company time; hot meals for employees; housing for employees to be purchased over time at cost and low interest rates; workers hostels; pensions; pensions for widows; indexed pensions; free medical and dental services for employees
Governance	Functional department organisation; multidivisional organisation; participative management; consensus building; works councils; appeals committees; profit sharing; cooperative ownership; employee selection of managers.
Accounting	Formal accounting and auditing
R&D	Research & development departments; hiring of university professors as consultants.
Banking	Provincial Banking; the cheque; bills of exchange

Quakers' concern with authenticity and honesty underpinned their everyday practices and business dealings. Grounded in belief, business was an expression of Quakers' undivided approach to business. The first Quaker shopkeepers would not bargain over prices or charge different prices for the same goods as these were all forms of dishonesty. While the market responded positively to these ideas—and made Quakers rich as a result—the practices were

founded on deep ethical beliefs rather than any self-interested calculation of market preferences. Indeed, George Fox was disdainful of the rich man, who he saw as the "greatest thief" because he acquired his wealth "by cozening and cheating, by lying and defrauding" (Hill 1991: 28).

This emphasis on honesty meant that Quakers had a dread of business failure and indebtedness (Tibbals 2017). As early as 1688, Friends were told, through the system of *Advices*, that none should "launch into trading and worldly business beyond what they can manage honourably and with reputation; so that they may keep their words with all men…the payment of just debts be not delayed" (Society of Friends 1802: 195). The Quaker administrative machinery, especially the meetings for business, proved effective in ensuring that Friends actively observed and upheld their principles. The meetings for business provided a frame for Friends to intervene with advice and help for members in financial difficulty: "It was assumed that Quakers would turn to each other for business advice; that more experienced heads would help the less so. Co-operation, not rivalry, was their commercial watchword" (Walvin 1997: 56). Quaker businesses were subjected to a level of scrutiny and a form of external audit that, in the eighteenth century, did not exist elsewhere in the commercial world.

A remarkable and distinctive attribute of the Quakers was their meticulous record-keeping and their passion for writing. Because of their explicit challenge to society's values and practices, Quakers had to devote considerable time and energy keeping meetings going themselves, to annual reporting of membership, as well as documenting persecution, and recording births, deaths and marriages. The Quaker fondness for writing and record-keeping provided an authentic record of their own struggles, having opted out of other formal institutions.

Quakers were acutely aware that their distinctive beliefs and practices had to be taught to and learned by the next generation if their culture was to survive: education was not only about present needs but primarily oriented to the future. For instance, by 1671 fifteen Quaker schools had been established. From the earliest days, meetings supervised the training of boy apprentices, choosing trades and masters and monitoring progress during the seven years of apprenticeship. Apprenticeships were also important in socializing young Quakers into the norms of their faith.

We should add a few words of critical caution to the depiction of Quakers' undivided approach to business. Extolling the virtues of a techno-scientific modernity, Quakers also benefitted from Britain's emerging empire and accumulated wealth from overseas trade. It is also easy to over-emphasize the idea of a distinctive "Quaker ethos" and the role that this played in "Quaker" businesses. For instance, Rowlinson and Hassard (1993) have argued that it was not Quaker beliefs but rather contemporary social movements of the late nineteenth century that led Cadbury to develop specific labour-management institutions, which were then retrospectively linked to a Quaker ethos in a perhaps cynical attempt to create a distinctive and enduring Cadbury culture and tradition (see also Rowlinson 1988). Moreover, the ethos associated with Cadbury and Rowntree was not replicated uniformly across all Quaker enterprises; for example, the Quaker firm of Bryant and May had extremely poor working conditions which led to the famous matchgirls' strike of 1888.

Dividing business and life

An intriguing part of the Quaker story is how and why lost their pre-eminent position in business from the late nineteenth century onwards. An important turning point hinges around developments in corporate law in the mid-nineteenth century, specifically the Limited Liability Act of 1855, the Joint Stock Companies Act of 1856, and the Companies Act of

1862. Until then, the Quaker companies were essentially family businesses or partnerships, but the limited liability form of ownership, combined with the joint stock company allowed the expansion of the company's capital base beyond family resources, and consequently family control. It is arguable that part of the reason the Quakers went into decline was because of their excessive concern with authenticity. Similar to the Puritans, they valorized honesty and integrity and hence disliked acting and lawyers, which they saw as inauthentic forms of behaviour. This Puritan pursuit of authenticity also meant that they disapproved of play unless it had a utilitarian benefit. For instance the 1738 Yearly Meeting complained of "particularly balls, gaming-places, horse-races, and playhouses" (Society of Friends 1858a: Epistle 1739: 227).

For the Quakers, the issue of limited liability struck to the core of their belief system as honesty in trade, including the avoidance of debt, was a condition of membership of the Religious Society of Friends from its inception in the 1660s. The message was consistent and constant. In 1754, an "epistle"—a letter from one Friends' body to another—exhorted members at monthly meetings "to be properly watchful over one another, and early to caution all against running beyond their depth, and entangling themselves in a greater multiplicity of trade and business than they can extricate themselves from with honour and reputation" (Society of Friends 1858b: Epistle 1754: 290-1). The notion of limited liability directly contradicted this, in that, for many, it rewarded and encouraged dishonesty. And, in line with the Protestant ethic, failure in the realm of work raised suspicions of sin, imprudence and a breach of the religious imperative to make one's outward life congruent with one's inward life.

While advocates of limited liability pointed to the difference between a loss caused by intentional dishonesty and a loss resulting from unintentional carelessness or bad luck – and also highlighted the value of mitigating practices, such as publishing company registration

information – such nuances made little impression on the Quakers. This was partly because, notwithstanding their deep engagement in the world of commerce, most Quakers had, with some exceptions, either been largely excluded or withdrawn from the public sphere and mainstream politics during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and up until the mid-nineteenth century they deeply distrusted elections and party politics (Isichei 1970). Not surprisingly, therefore, they made little contribution to public discourse about the concept of limited liability prior to passing of the Companies Act. Tellingly, many Quakers at the London Yearly Meeting of 1918 voiced serious concern about the immorality of limited liability, but the reality was that that debate had effectively concluded over fifty years previously.

The Quaker perspective on the joint stock companies was framed by their belief in the importance of the individual, which meant that for Quakers, and for many others, the "corporation" is a collection of individuals rather than a singular, distinct entity. This is clear from the language used: up to the mid-nineteenth century, companies, whether incorporated or not, were invariably referred to in the plural rather than the singular—the term "company" being short for a "company of proprietors" or similar (Taylor 2014: 12). As the idea of the company as a distinctly separate entity emerged around that time, singular verbs and nouns came to dominate and the use of plural constructions to describe the company went into decline (Lamoreaux 2004: 44-45). This was a widely-held belief, but what made the Quakers distinctive was their long-standing tradition of individualism and their consequent suspicion of collectivist models of the world. This was also an important reason why many Quakers disliked trade unions and the socialist focus on collective action, power and social class (Freeman 2013). Hence, the notion of the company as a unitary entity, separate from its constituting individuals, was contrary to their individualistic outlook.

Notwithstanding their success in commerce, Quakers were less able to shape the wider political, social and legislative thinking during the emerging factory and machine age of the mid and late nineteenth century, which, ironically, the Quakers had been central in making a reality. In particular, the enactment in law of the company as a distinct legal entity where responsibility and liability could be limited, worked to divide religious belief from socio-political and economic values. Another effect of these legislative changes was to create a clear distinction between the shareholders and the managers, which marked a major change from the partnership model—favoured by the Quakers—where the owners were invariably actively involved in managing the business. Thus, in many ways, the new dispensation was inimical to the Quakers' undivided approach to business and life. Quakers saw their business as a service if not a religious calling, with this service motive operating as a counter to the profit motive. This is not to say that the Quakers were against making a profit; rather they saw profit as a necessary by-product of a successful business, which ultimately was for a service to God and a way of working for common good.

Faced with this dilemma, many of the big Quaker businesses converted to the corporate form by the end of the nineteenth century: Reckitt's in 1888, Crosfield's in 1896, Rowntree's in 1897 and Cadbury in 1899. Always with an eye on being modern, the Quaker companies' willingness to embrace the new corporate form was consistent with their enthusiasm for innovation—whether these be technological, organizational, managerial or new forms of governance and corporate ownership. Yet, the great wave of incorporation in the 1890s marked the beginning of the end of the Quaker undivided business philosophy. The issues were complex and incorporation was certainly not the only reason why the philosophy unravelled, but it did coincide with a major transition in how Quakers conceptualised their role in the economy and society. During the twentieth century, the Quaker enthusiasm for commerce waned and the Quakers moved, or were shifted, inexorably out of the commercial

world as ownership passed progressively out of the families and into institutions. Today, the most famous "Quaker" companies – such as Cadbury and Barclays – are only Quaker by historical association.

Conclusions and futures

The Quaker belief in plainness, brevity and silence was a reaction to what they saw as the "Babelish confusion" of religion in mid-seventeenth century England (Bauman 1983: 1). This confusion (albeit not religious) exists today, with an excess of language, information, constructs, and theories, a phenomenon in which academia has played a not insignificant role. Ghoshal (2005: 79) puts it bluntly: "By propagating ideologically inspired amoral theories, business schools have actively freed their students from any sense of moral responsibility", which then leads to bad business and management practices. If there is a contemporary "Babelish confusion", then a neo-Quaker inspired response might be expected as the Quakers seem to provide a coherent and compelling model of how business might be organized for the greater good of individuals, communities and society by thinking more about ends and purposes and connecting the art of living with earning a livelihood.

Quaker history, beliefs and practices provide a valuable lens for understanding contemporary responses to information overload, confusion and what Ghoshal refers to as "ideology-based gloomy vision". The early Quakers considered themselves part of an "Adventurous Society," integrating religious belief with worldly action to transform society towards the Light – an undivided approach to business, work and life. Quakers' Holy Experiment in business is significant not because of their successes or ultimate failure but because they remind us that "the great achievements of the past were the adventures of the past" (Alfred North Whitehead quoted in Castle 1941: 68). What will be the form, character and qualities of the adventure of the future and will that future be shaped by a divided or undivided worldview of business,

economy and society? Such questions, our answers to them and the new purposes they create is our responsibility in memory of the future.

References

Baltzell, E. D. (1996), *Puritan Boston and Quaker Philadelphia*, New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.

Barclay, A. (1995), 'The Rise and Fall of the Friends', *Management Today*, (1 February): 52–58.

Bauman, R. (1983), *Let Your Words be Few: Symbolism of Speaking and Silence Among Seventeenth-century Quakers.* Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Belden, T. G. and Belden, M. R. (1962), *The Lengthening Shadow: the Life of Thomas J. Watson*, Boston: Little, Brown.

Burton, N. (2017), "Quaker Business Method: a Contemporary Decision-Making Process?'. In: S. W. Angell and P. Dandelion (eds.) *Quakers, Business, and* Industry, Volume 4, Longmeadow, MA: Friends Association for Higher Education.

Castle, E. B. (1941), *The Undivided Mind.* Swarthmore Lecture, 1941, London: George Allen & Unwin.

Child, J. (1964), 'Quaker Employers and Industrial Relations', *The Sociological Review*, 12 (No. 3): 293-315.

Copley, F. B. (1923), *Frederick W. Taylor: Father of Scientific Management*, New York: Harper and Brothers.

Freeman, M. (2013), 'Quakers, Business and Philanthropy'. In: S. W. Angell and P. Dandelion (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Quaker Studies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 420-433.

Furtado, P. (2013), *Quakers.* Oxford: Shire Publications.

Ghoshal, S. (2005), 'Bad Management Theories are Destroying Good Management Practices', *Academy Of Management Learning and Education*, 4 (No. 1): 75-91.

Hill, C. (1991), 'Quakers and the English Revolution'. In: M. Mullett (ed.) *New Light on George Fox, 1624–1691*. York: The Ebor Press.

Hopper, K. and Hopper, W. (2010), *The Puritan Gift: Reclaiming the American Dream Amidst Global Financial Chaos*, London: I.B. Tauris.

Isichei, E. (1970) *Victorian Quakers*, London: Oxford University Press.

Kavanagh, D. and Brigham, M. (2018), 'Quakers: Forgotten Pioneers'. In: Peltonen, T., Gaggiotti, H. and Case, P. (eds.) *Origins of Organizing*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 147-168

Kavanagh, D. and Brigham, M. (2019), 'The Quakers and Joint Stock Company: Uneasy Bedfellows'. In: Burton, N. and Turnbull, R. (eds.) *Quakers, Business and Corporate Responsibility: Lessons and Cases for Responsible Management*. Cham: Springer, pp. 111-128.

Lamoreaux, N. (2004), 'Partnerships, Corporations and the Limits on Contractual Freedom in US History: an Essay in Economics, Law, and Culture'. In: K. Lipartito and D. B. Sicilia (eds.) *Constructing Corporate America: History, Politics, Culture*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 29-64.

Morley, B. (1993), *Beyond Consensus: Salvaging Sense of the Meeting*, Wallingford, PA: Pendle Hill.

Navias, M. (2012), *Quaker Process: For Friends on the Benches*, Philadelphia, PA: Friends Publishing Corporation.

Pym, J. (1999), *Listening to the Light: How to Bring Quaker Simplicity and Integrity into Our Lives*, London: Rider.

Raistrick, A. (1950/1968), *Quakers in Science and Industry: Being an Account of the Quaker Contributions to Science and Industry during the 17th and 18th Centuries*, New York: Kelley.

Rowlinson, M. (1988), 'The Early Application of Scientific Management by Cadbury', *Business History*, 30 (No. 4): 377-395.

Rowlinson, M. and Hassard, J. (1993), 'The Invention of Corporate Culture: a History of the Histories of Cadbury', *Human Relations*, 46 (No. 3): 299-326.

Sheeran, M. J. (1983) *Beyond Majority Rule: Voteless Decisions in the Religious Society of Friends*, Philadelphia, PA: Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends.

Society of Friends (1802), *Extracts from the Minutes and Advices of the Yearly Meeting of Friends held in London*, London: Society of Friends.

Society of Friends (1858a), *Epistles from the Yearly Meeting of Friends, I*, London: Society of Friends.

Society of Friends (1858b), *Epistles from the Yearly Meeting of Friends, II*, London: Society of Friends.

Society of Friends (1918), *Foundations of a True Social Order*, London: Society of Friends.

Society of Friends (1938), 'Quakerism and Industry'. In: H. G. Tanner (ed.) *Report of the Conference,* Birmingham, Quaker Employers Conference. Friends Book Centre.

Taylor, J. (2014), *Creating Capitalism: Joint-Stock Enterprise in British Politics and Culture, 1800-1870*, London: Royal Historical Society/Boydell Press.

Tibbals, K. (2017), 'Early Quakers and "Just Debt"'. In: S. W Angell and P. Dandelion (eds.) *Quakers, Business, and Industry*, Volume 4, Longmeadow, MA: Friends Association for Higher Education, pp. 133-167.

Urwick, L. F. (1962), 'The Father of British Management', *The Manager,* 30 (No. 2): 42–43.

Vernon, A. and Rowntree, J. (1958), *A Quaker Business Man: the Life of Joseph Rowntree, 1836-1925*, London: George Allen & Unwin.

Walvin, J. (1997), *The Quakers: money and morals*, London: John Murray.

Weber, M. (2002/1905), *The Protestant Work Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism and Other Essays*, London: Penguin.

Windsor, D. B. (1980), *The Quaker Enterprise: Friends in Business*, London: Muller.

Wren, D. A. (ed.) (1997), *Early Management Thought*, Aldershot: Dartmouth.

Wrigley, E. A. and Schofield, R. (1989), *The Population History of England, 1541-1871: A Reconstruction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.